

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 are rejected. Because of the clear differences between the prior art at issue and the limitations of the present claims, no amendments to the claims are considered necessary.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to remarks and arguments made by applicants in response to the first Office Action (remarks reproduced further below). Though a subsequent interview may be necessary to further clarify the differences between the Li reference and the limitations cited in the present claims, Applicants are submitting this Amendment After Final in the hopes that such differences can be understood without interview or Appeal. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks below further distinguishing the Li reference from the elements claimed.

The Examiner has continued with the rejection of claims 1-23, under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the paper published in CHI, April 2000, entitled "Browsing Digital Video" by Li, et al. The language of the rejections is identical with that of the first Office Action.

Applicants' arguments distinguishing Li from the present claims were considered but not persuasive. Namely, the Examiner contends that the "Shot Boundary Frames" section in the Li graphic user interface [Li Figure 1], and the video frame highlighted, is equivalent to Ensequence's claimed "focus position." The Examiner further contends that this Shot Boundary Frames interface allows one to move the second control object (e.g., second video frame) into the focus position and the first control object (e.g., an adjacent video frame) out of the focus position.

We disagree with the Examiner's conclusions on two main grounds. First, Li does not teach a focus position. While Applicants agree that if read broadly the Li graphic user interface could be interpreted to show a "focus" which corresponds to a highlighting feature of the respective video frame, Li does not teach a "focus position" as required in the pending claims. Instead, the highlighted video frame of Li can be anywhere within the shot boundary frames section located at the bottom of the Li graphic user interface [Li Figure 1]. Just as the highlighting feature of Li cannot be interpreted as a focus position, the entire boundary frames section itself cannot also be interpreted as a focus position. The shot boundary frames section cannot be considered the focus position in gross because, when using the Li interface, a user can move the highlighted video frame completely out of window by moving the slider bar just under the video frames. Since there is no location within the Li interface that

corresponds to a "focus" that triggers play of the video frame displayed at that location, Li cannot be said to teach a focus position.

In a second difference between the prior art and the present invention, Li does not perform the focus frame "moving" step as set forth in the pending claims. Applicants' reading of the Li reference indicates that Li can enable a user to select one video frame (thus playing that frame in the display window) and then select an adjacent video frame to play. However, such a procedure moves the focus frame from one location or "position" to another. In other words, the Li GUI does not "move the second control object to the focus position and the first control object out of the focus position" as in claim 1 of the application. Li acts in reverse. That is, Li moves the focus position from a first position where the first control object is to a second (and different) position where the second control object is. Such an interface has very different application to the present invention and, accordingly, would not anticipate it under §102(a).

Applicants arguments are summarized in the table below:

Examiner's Remarks	Distinction
"Inspection of Figure 1 of Li indicates that the focus position is indicated in the "Shot boundary frames" section, wherein the current shot that is being displayed simultaneously with the video being displayed is the frame that is highlighted or "in focus".	Li does not teach focus <u>position</u> since highlighted video frame can be at any point within the Li interface including completely out of the shot boundary frame window (e.g. when the user is traversing (but not selecting for play) other video frames).
"The focus position of Li represents the video frame that is highlighted, wherein the contents of this frame is also simultaneously played in the main video window of Figure 1 of Li."	Again, there is seems to be some confusion between "focus" and "focus position". While the highlighting feature of Li can be interpreted as a focus feature, the focus is location independent and thus not a focus position.
"Li discloses traversing the shot boundary frames, wherein this traversing allows the highlighted frame to be the next frame adjacent to the current highlighted frame, wherein the second control object focus would be the next frame that is traversed to by the user."	Li moves the focus to the objects, not vice versa (i.e. the objects to the focus position) as required under the pending claims.

The Arguments below were presented in response to the first Office Action and have been included below for reference.

Li Does Not Disclose or Suggest a Focus Position for Control Objects and Thus Cannot Anticipate the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by "Browsing Digital Video" (Li et al.), a paper published in CHI in April 2000.

The Examiner makes the following statement in rejecting claims 1 and 19:

Li discloses displaying a first control object, associated with the displayed first video segment, on the display screen in a focus position simultaneous with the display of a first video segment on the display screen (Figure 1). Li discloses displaying a second control object, associated with a second video segment, adjacent to the focus position and moving the second control object to the focus position, and the first control object out of the focus position, in substantial synchronicity with a transition between the display of the first video segment and the second video segment on the display screen (page 3, Figure 1 and column 1, lines 1-10). [Nov. 12, 2004 OA Paragraph 1 (emphasis added)]

Applicants can find no reference to focus position, no functional equivalent to a focus position, and no step is disclosed in Li of “moving the second control object to the focus position, and the first control object out of the focus position” as asserted in the Examiner’s statement above. Instead, Li discloses in Figure 1 a user interface for quickly jumping to certain portions of a video by providing, using a detection algorithm, a plurality of shot boundary frames along a bottom of a browser window. The shot boundary frames are arranged horizontally in a scrolling list of such frames. Figure 1 states that a “user can seek a selected part of video by [scrolling to and then] clicking on [the] shot.” The current shot, when clicked is highlighted and the video segment associated with that shot is played in the video display window. By scrolling the frames ahead, the participants could preview and seek to successive plays. (Li page 174, Col. 1)

It is clear from the disclosure in Li, therefore, that there is no focus frame since the video play has no association with the location within the user interface window of the shot boundary associated with it. For Li to teach the limitations found in claims 1 and 19 (and 10), the shot boundary frame associated with a currently playing video would have to be positioned within a certain location within the scrolling list and, as the video segment plays out and the next video segment plays, the shot boundary frame would scroll out of the focus frame (e.g. a fixed position on the browser window within the scrolling list) and the next shot boundary frame move into the focus frame. Li clearly does not show this, however, and thus does not anticipate or suggest limitations set forth within the pending claims. Such functionality would be contrary to the teachings of Li, in fact, since the object of Li is to provide a browsable visual list of shot boundaries. To include a focus frame would not allow the user of the Li user interface to view images beyond the five shown in Figure 1 while playing an earlier occurring video segment. This is clearly not the goal of Li which instead intends to allow a user to browse to images well beyond the current video segment play to anticipate a resolution of such video. “Features that support skimming visually, such as shot boundaries, were more useful here than in previous scenarios.” (Li page 174, Col. 1)

As all independent claims of the present application teach the concept of focus frames and objects moving to and from said focus positions in synchronicity with a transition of videos, and Li fails to disclose such a feature, all claims should be allowable over Li.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-23 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.


Scott A. Schaffer
Reg. No. 38,610

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575